



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,484	02/28/2002	Mark A. Kirkpatrick	BS01-177	7050
38516	7590	02/23/2005	EXAMINER	
SCOTT P. ZIMMERMAN, PLLC			CHU, GABRIEL L	
PO BOX 3822			ART UNIT	
CARY, NC 27519			PAPER NUMBER	

2114

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/084,484	Applicant(s) KIRKPATRICK ET AL.	
	Examiner Gabriel L. Chu	Art Unit 2114	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 14,15 and 29-39 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 16-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6219648 to Jones et al.
3. Referring to claim 1, Jones et al. disclose providing communication between a monitor process software and an output file for receipt by the monitor process software of a notification message held by the output file (From line 35 of column 11, "When a new trouble ticket record is received from the parsing module, it is added by the manager module to a list of tickets to watch."); determining if the notification message is a matching notification message or a non-matching notification message by using a rule set (From line 48 of column 3, "The data may include pending customer generated trouble tickets. Moreover, the parsing module determines whether each pending customer generated trouble ticket is related to a preceding pending customer generated trouble ticket. If a relationship is determined, the parsing module does not generate a data record for the subsequent pending customer generated trouble ticket."); and producing a severity level for an error referred to in the notification message; and producing a contact list (From line 16 of column 9, "Status, Position, Age". Wherein the age indicates severity.).
4. Referring to claim 2, Jones et al. disclose the notification message is non-matching when the notification message does not match any predetermined notification

messages within the monitor process message database (From line 48 of column 3, "The data may include pending customer generated trouble tickets. Moreover, the parsing module determines whether each pending customer generated trouble ticket is related to a preceding pending customer generated trouble ticket. If a relationship is determined, the parsing module does not generate a data record for the subsequent pending customer generated trouble ticket." Further, from line 11 of column 10, "The parsing module combines the trouble tickets having the same master ticket number by simply checking if a trouble ticket has a master ticket number and if the trouble ticket has one, comparing the master ticket number to the master ticket number of the previously processed trouble ticket. If the master ticket numbers are identical, the data in the second trouble ticket is ignored.").

5. Referring to claim 3, Jones et al. disclose the notification message is intended to notify an error discovered or caused by a software application (From line 49 of column 11, "Increasing durations of non-resolution (e.g., that are detected based on the trouble ticket time duration) may be sent to higher levels of management or service personnel.").

6. Referring to claim 4, Jones et al. disclose providing a user interface for displaying the non-matching notification message, the severity, and the contact list one or more users (From line 51 of column 5, "In a preferred embodiment, the notification comprises an alphanumeric or digital page, an e-mail message, or an X-Windows terminal display message. Of course, other types of electronic messages may be also be used. The notification may contain various information, including the trouble ticket number, an

escalation level, the date and time the ticket was first entered into the WFA system, the service type having trouble, customer name, current status of the ticket and the identification (e.i. initials) of the technician involved in the service restoration effort.”); and providing the one or more users the ability to modify the severity and contact list (From line 61 of column 5, “Escalation levels may be defined based on the trouble ticket remaining unresolved for a time exceeding user specified time intervals. The escalation levels also control which management level or personnel will receive the alerting message or page notification. Thus, different recipients may be alerted when different time intervals are exceeded. The escalation intervals, pager numbers, notification messages, and other parameters may be customized through user-maintained configuration files.”).

7. Referring to claim 5, Jones et al. disclose providing export by the monitor process software to the system monitor message database of the modified or unmodified severity and the modified or unmodified contact list (From line 35 of column 11, “When a new trouble ticket record is received from the parsing module, it is added by the manager module to a list of tickets to watch.”).

8. Referring to claim 7, Jones et al. disclose the user interface is graphical and wherein the user interface also displays a description of the non-matching notification message (From line 51 of column 5, “In a preferred embodiment, the notification comprises an alphanumeric or digital page, an e-mail message, or an X-Windows terminal display message. Of course, other types of electronic messages may be also be used. The notification may contain various information, including the trouble ticket

number, an escalation level, the date and time the ticket was first entered into the WFA system, the service type having trouble, customer name, current status of the ticket and the identification (e.i. initials) of the technician involved in the service restoration effort.”); and the monitor process software is also providing the ability for the one or more users to modify the description (From line 61 of column 5, “Escalation levels may be defined based on the trouble ticket remaining unresolved for a time exceeding user specified time intervals. The escalation levels also control which management level or personnel will receive the alerting message or page notification. Thus, different recipients may be alerted when different time intervals are exceeded. The escalation intervals, pager numbers, notification messages, and other parameters may be customized through user-maintained configuration files.”).

9. Referring to claim 6, Jones et al. disclose the monitor process software is also providing export of the modified description or the description to the system monitor message database (From line 35 of column 11, “When a new trouble ticket record is received from the parsing module, it is added by the manager module to a list of tickets to watch.”).

10. Referring to claim 8, Jones et al. disclose Jones et al. disclose communicating with an output file of a software application to receive the non-matching notification message (From line 35 of column 11, “When a new trouble ticket record is received from the parsing module, it is added by the manager module to a list of tickets to watch.” Further, from line 48 of column 3, “The data may include pending customer generated trouble tickets. Moreover, the parsing module determines whether each pending

Art Unit: 2114

customer generated trouble ticket is related to a preceding pending customer generated trouble ticket. If a relationship is determined, the parsing module does not generate a data record for the subsequent pending customer generated trouble ticket.”); producing a severity level and a contact list using a rule set , the severity level describing an error referred to in the non-matching notification message (From line 16 of column 9, “Status, Position, Age”. Wherein age indicates severity.); and communicating to one or more members of the contact list the severity level and the non-matching notification message (From line 51 of column 5, “In a preferred embodiment, the notification comprises an alphanumeric or digital page, an e-mail message, or an X-Windows terminal display message. Of course, other types of electronic messages may be also be used. The notification may contain various information, including the trouble ticket number, an escalation level, the date and time the ticket was first entered into the WFA system, the service type having trouble, customer name, current status of the ticket and the identification (e.i. initials) of the technician involved in the service restoration effort.”).

11. Referring to claim 9, Jones et al. disclose communicating to the one or members of the contact list is performed through email (From line 51 of column 5, “In a preferred embodiment, the notification comprises an alphanumeric or digital page, an e-mail message, or an X-Windows terminal display message.”).

12. Referring to claim 10, Jones et al. disclose the form of communication to the one or members of the contact list is a graphical user interface (the form of communication to the one or members of the contact list is a graphical user interface.).

13. Referring to claim 11, Jones et al. disclose displaying the non-matching notification message, the severity level, the contact list, and a description in a table in the graphical user interface (From line 51 of column 5, "In a preferred embodiment, the notification comprises an alphanumeric or digital page, an e-mail message, or an X- Windows terminal display message. Of course, other types of electronic messages may be also be used. The notification may contain various information, including the trouble ticket number, an escalation level, the date and time the ticket was first entered into the WFA system, the service type having trouble, customer name, current status of the ticket and the identification (e.i. initials) of the technician involved in the service restoration effort.").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

15. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6219648 to Jones et al. as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of US 6377949 to Gilmour.

16. Referring to claim 12, although Jones et al. do not specifically disclose the step of producing a severity level and a contact list using a rule set further comprises: searching text of the non-matching notification message for terms included within the rule set; and matching the terms included within the rule set with predetermined severity levels within the rule set, using terms to determine a severity level is known in the art. An example of this is shown by Gilmour, from the abstract, "A method of assigning a

confidence level to a term within an electronic document, such as an e-mail, includes the step of firstly determining a quantitative indicator in the exemplary form of an occurrence value, based on the number of occurrences of a particular term within an electronic document, and associating the occurrence term within the relevant term. Thereafter, a qualitative indicator, based on a quality of the term, is determined. For example, the qualitative indicator may be determined utilizing the parts of speech of words comprising the term. A confidence level value, which may be utilized to indicate a relative importance of the term in describing a user knowledge base, is then generated utilizing the quantitative and qualitative indicators.” A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to assign a severity based on matching terms because, from line 10 of column 2 of Gilmour, “As alluded to above, even once a satisfactory knowledge management information base has been established, the practical utilization thereof to achieve maximum potential benefit may be challenging. Specifically, ensuring that the captured information is readily organized, available, and accessible as appropriate throughout the organization may be problematic.”

17. Referring to claim 13, Jones et al. in view of Gilmour disclose weighing the matching predetermined severity levels to produce a severity level for the non-patching notification message (From line 50 of column 15, “At step 186, a characteristic (or qualitative) indicator in the form of a term weight value is determined, based on characteristics qualities of the term such as those represented by the Type and Part of Speech indications discussed above.”).

18. Claims 16-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6219648 to Jones et al.

19. Referring to claim 16, Jones et al. disclose communicating with an output file of a software application to import a notification message (From line 35 of column 11, "When a new trouble ticket record is received from the parsing module, it is added by the manager module to a list of tickets to watch."); comparing the notification message to a message database to determine if the notification message is a non-matching notification message (From line 48 of column 3, "The data may include pending customer generated trouble tickets. Moreover, the parsing module determines whether each pending customer generated trouble ticket is related to a preceding pending customer generated trouble ticket. If a relationship is determined, the parsing module does not generate a data record for the subsequent pending customer generated trouble ticket."); communicating the non-matching notification message and a severity level to one or more persons through a graphical user interface, the severity level describing an error referred to in the non-matching notification message (From line 51 of column 5, "In a preferred embodiment, the notification comprises an alphanumeric or digital page, an e-mail message, or an X-Windows terminal display message. Of course, other types of electronic messages may be also be used. The notification may contain various information, including the trouble ticket number, an escalation level, the date and time the ticket was first entered into the WFA system, the service type having trouble, customer name, current status of the ticket and the identification (e.i. initials) of the technician involved in the service restoration effort." Wherein age indicates severity.

Wherein age describes severity.). and modifying the severity by using input from the one or more persons (From line 61 of column 5, "Escalation levels may be defined based on the trouble ticket remaining unresolved for a time exceeding user specified time intervals. The escalation levels also control which management level or personnel will receive the alerting message or page notification. Thus, different recipients may be alerted when different time intervals are exceeded. The escalation intervals, pager numbers, notification messages, and other parameters may be customized through user-maintained configuration files." Further, from line 11 of column 7, "According to an aspect of the invention, the trouble report information may be provided to the PUMBA application 26 by an On-line Query System (OQS) and Manager Scratch Pad (MSP) feed from the WFA host of system 10. The On-line Query system is a report system within the WFA system. The OQS system transmits data to the MSP. The MSP is a tool which allows manipulating the data received from the OQS." Further, from line). Although Jones et al. do not specifically disclose the input is input into the graphical user interface, using a GUI for input is notoriously well known in the art. An example of this is shown in the Windows operating system. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to use a GUI to modify data because it enables the user to access a position in the data directly, and the use of such tools as mice and icons.

20. Referring to claim 17, Jones et al. disclose exporting the modified severity in a format compatible with a system monitor such that the system monitor message database may be updated (From line 56 of column 8, "The PUMBA parse module (e.g.,

"pumba_parse") is a software tool for dissecting and processing the data received from the OQS report into individual data (ticket) records. In a preferred embodiment, the parse module of the PUMBA application 26 strips off extraneous header information in the OQS reports, and then filters incorrectly formatted data prior to transmitting the relevant OQS report information to the PUMBA manager module (e.g., "pumba_mgr").").

21. Referring to claim 18, Jones et al. disclose as part of the step of exporting the modified severity in a format compatible with a system monitor such that the system monitor message database may be updated, translating a representation of the modified severity from numerical form to textual form to be compatible with the system monitor (From line 23 of column 15, "In addition, daily log files may be provided to log monitoring and alerting activity. For this purpose, daily ASCII log files may be generated which log activity of the PUMBA parse module and PUMBA manager module.").

22. Referring to claim 19, Jones et al. disclose as part of the step of exporting the modified severity in a format compatible with a system monitor such that the system monitor message database may be updated, translating a representation of the modified severity from textual form to numerical form to be compatible with the system monitor (From line 34 of column 10, "(iii) first parsing each line of the OQS report file for the service center name, then parsing for the remaining trouble ticket data; (iv) transmitting, when the prior ticket does not have the same master ticket number

information, the trouble ticket data via the TCP/IP connection to the PUMBA manager module”).).

23. Referring to claim 20, Jones et al. disclose the severity is determined using a rule set (From the abstract, ‘An alerting system is provided for proactively ensuring awareness of pending customer generated trouble tickets which have not been resolved for at least a predetermined time duration corresponding to an escalation level.”).

24. Referring to claim 21, Jones et al. disclose the step of communicating the non-matching notification message and a severity to one or more persons through a graphical user interface also includes communicating a description (From line 51 of column 5, “In a preferred embodiment, the notification comprises an alphanumeric or digital page, an e-mail message, or an X-Windows terminal display message. Of course, other types of electronic messages may be also be used. The notification may contain various information, including the trouble ticket number, an escalation level, the date and time the ticket was first entered into the WFA system, the service type having trouble, customer name, current status of the ticket and the identification (e.i. initials) of the technician involved in the service restoration effort.”).

25. Referring to claim 22, Jones et al. disclose the step of communicating the non-matching notification message and a severity to one or more persons through a graphical user interface also includes communicating a contact list (From line 51 of column 5, “In a preferred embodiment, the notification comprises an alphanumeric or digital page, an e-mail message, or an X-Windows terminal display message. Of course, other types of electronic messages may be also be used. The notification may

Art Unit: 2114

contain various information, including the trouble ticket number, an escalation level, the date and time the ticket was first entered into the WFA system, the service type having trouble, customer name, current status of the ticket and the identification (e.i. initials) of the technician involved in the service restoration effort.”).

26. Referring to claim 23, Jones et al. disclose the step of modifying the severity by using input from the one or more persons input into the graphical user interface also includes modifying the contact list through input by the one or more persons into the graphical user interface (From line 18 of column 3, “Moreover, a user may define at least one recipient for each escalation level.”).

27. Referring to claim 24, Jones et al. disclose the step of exporting the modified severity in a format compatible with a system monitor such that the system monitor message database may be updated also includes exporting a modified contact list (From line 56 of column 8, “The PUMBA parse module (e.g., “pumba_parse”) is a software tool for dissecting and processing the data received from the OQS report into individual data (ticket) records. In a preferred embodiment, the parse module of the PUMBA application 26 strips off extraneous header information in the OQS reports, and then filters incorrectly formatted data prior to transmitting the relevant OQS report information to the PUMBA manager module (e.g., “pumba_mgr”).”).

28. Referring to claim 25, Jones et al. disclose sending an alert to one or more members of the contact list if the severity has not been modified within a time period (From the abstract, “The alerting system also includes an alerting module which sends an alert to a recipient assigned to the escalation level when the manager module

Art Unit: 2114

determines the pending customer generated trouble ticket has not been resolved for the time duration corresponding to the escalation level.”).

29. Referring to claim 26, Jones et al. disclose recording the non-matching notification message and identification of the one or more persons if the one or more persons has not modified the severity within a second time period (From line 63 of column 3, “An alerting system is also provided for proactively ensuring awareness of pending customer generated trouble tickets which have not been resolved for at least a predetermined time corresponding to an escalation level. The time is selected by a customer service center. The alerting system includes a manager module and an alerting module. The manager module periodically monitors the pending customer generated trouble tickets to determine whether each pending customer generated trouble ticket remains unresolved for the time corresponding to the escalation level. The alerting module sends an alert to a recipient assigned to the escalation level when the manager module determines the pending customer generated trouble ticket remains unresolved for the time corresponding to the escalation level. The alerting system may also include a report generator which generates a report logging each alert sent by the alerting module.” Further from line 49 of column 11, “Increasing durations of non-resolution (e.g., that are detected based on the trouble ticket time duration) may be sent to higher levels of management or service personnel.”).

30. Referring to claim 27, Jones et al. disclose the contact list is determined using a rule set (From the abstract, “The alerting system also includes an alerting module which sends an alert to a recipient assigned to the escalation level when the manager module

determines the pending customer generated trouble ticket has not been resolved for the time duration corresponding to the escalation level.”).

31. Referring to claim 28, Jones et al. disclose a step of modifying the contact list (From line 61 of column 5, “Escalation levels may be defined based on the trouble ticket remaining unresolved for a time exceeding user specified time intervals. The escalation levels also control which management level or personnel will receive the alerting message or page notification. Thus, different recipients may be alerted when different time intervals are exceeded. The escalation intervals, pager numbers, notification messages, and other parameters may be customized through user-maintained configuration files.”).

Allowable Subject Matter

32. Claims 14, 15, 29-39 allowed.

Response to Arguments

33. Applicant's arguments filed 8 December 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's argument that Jones does not teach a severity level for an error referred to in the notification message, Jones has disclosed from line 61 of column 5, “Escalation levels may be defined based on the trouble ticket remaining unresolved for a time exceeding user specified time intervals.” Applicant has not claimed the requirements for describing error severity.

Regarding Applicant's argument that claims 1 and 8 recite escalating trouble tickets according to the error, Applicants have not claimed this.

Conclusion

34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 5475838 to Fehskens et al., "The structure of the exception definition field 92 is similar to that of the response definition field 91, including fields 111 through 117, which are similar to fields 101 through 107 of the response definition field 21. The severity field 112, however, can contain three values, including WARNING, ERROR and FATAL, indicating the severity of the error giving rise to the exception."

US 5673390 to Mueller, ""Show error numbers" toggles the display of the assigned message numbers and severity codes to the left of the corresponding error messages. Message numbers are generally only useful for looking items up in a book or reporting problems to service, and so are not shown by default. A check is displayed next to this action when selected."

US 2002/0178404 to Austen et al., "[0035] The present invention provides a method to prioritize multiple errors reported from a PCI bus and order the errors in a systematic list. When a system makes a machine check, an operating system calls a routine to isolate an error that caused an exception. The error is reported back to the operating system in an error log. A routine searches for errors stored in registers and analyzes the errors as they are discovered. A severity factor is assigned to the error type and operation. The sum of the error type and operation severity factors determines the error severity level. Each error is then listed in a prioritized list. When the machine check is completed, the prioritized list is returned to the operating system."

US 2003/0074601 to Schultz et al., "[0126] Error Severity Escalation: To simplify error handling or to give certain errors a different priority level, system software may escalate errors to a higher severity level."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gabriel L. Chu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3656. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays between 8:30 AM and 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel, Jr. can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

gc

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert Beausoliel", with a stylized flourish at the end.

ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100